

1 K. Lee Marshall (SBN 277092)
 2 Abigail Cotton (SBN 306121)
 3 BRYAN CAVE LEIGHTON PAISNER LLP
 4 Three Embarcadero Center, 7th Floor
 5 San Francisco, CA 94111-4078
 6 Telephone: (415) 675-3444
 7 klmmarshall@bclplaw.com
 8 abby.cotton@bclplaw.com

9 David A. Roodman (appearance *pro hac vice*)
 10 Nick Williamson (appearance *pro hac vice*)
 11 BRYAN CAVE LEIGHTON PAISNER LLP
 12 One Metropolitan Square, 36th Floor
 13 St. Louis, MO 63102
 14 Telephone: (314) 259-2000
 15 daroodman@bclplaw.com
 16 nick.williamson@bclplaw.com

17 Daniel P. Crane (appearance *pro hac vice*)
 18 BRYAN CAVE LEIGHTON PAISNER LLP
 19 Two North Central Avenue, Suite 2100
 20 Phoenix, AZ 85004
 21 Telephone: (602) 364-7000
 22 dan.crane@bclplaw.com

23 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
 24 *Fluidigm Corporation and Fluidigm Canada Inc.*

25
 26
 27
 28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525
 526
 527
 528
 529
 530
 531
 532
 533
 534
 535
 536
 537
 538
 539
 540
 541
 542
 543
 544
 545
 546
 547
 548
 549
 550
 551
 552
 553
 554
 555
 556
 557
 558
 559
 560
 561
 562
 563
 564
 565
 566
 567
 568
 569
 570
 571
 572
 573
 574
 575
 576
 577
 578
 579
 580
 581
 582
 583
 584
 585
 586
 587
 588
 589
 590
 591
 592
 593
 594
 595
 596
 597
 598
 599
 600
 601
 602
 603
 604
 605
 606
 607
 608
 609
 610
 611
 612
 613
 614
 615
 616
 617
 618
 619
 620
 621
 622
 623
 624
 625
 626
 627
 628
 629
 630
 631
 632
 633
 634
 635
 636
 637
 638
 639
 640
 641
 642
 643
 644
 645
 646
 647
 648
 649
 650
 651
 652
 653
 654
 655
 656
 657
 658
 659
 660
 661
 662
 663
 664
 665
 666
 667
 668
 669
 670
 671
 672
 673
 674
 675
 676
 677
 678
 679
 680
 681
 682
 683
 684
 685
 686
 687
 688
 689
 690
 691
 692
 693
 694
 695
 696
 697
 698
 699
 700
 701
 702
 703
 704
 705
 706
 707
 708
 709
 710
 711
 712
 713
 714
 715
 716
 717
 718
 719
 720
 721
 722
 723
 724
 725
 726
 727
 728
 729
 730
 731
 732
 733
 734
 735
 736
 737
 738
 739
 740
 741
 742
 743
 744
 745
 746
 747
 748
 749
 750
 751
 752
 753
 754
 755
 756
 757
 758
 759
 760
 761
 762
 763
 764
 765
 766
 767
 768
 769
 770
 771
 772
 773
 774
 775
 776
 777
 778
 779
 780
 781
 782
 783
 784
 785
 786
 787
 788
 789
 790
 791
 792
 793
 794
 795
 796
 797
 798
 799
 800
 801
 802
 803
 804
 805
 806
 807
 808
 809
 810
 811
 812
 813
 814
 815
 816
 817
 818
 819
 820
 821
 822
 823
 824
 825
 826
 827
 828
 829
 830
 831
 832
 833
 834
 835
 836
 837
 838
 839
 840
 841
 842
 843
 844
 845
 846
 847
 848
 849
 850
 851
 852
 853
 854
 855
 856
 857
 858
 859
 860
 861
 862
 863
 864
 865
 866
 867
 868
 869
 870
 871
 872
 873
 874
 875
 876
 877
 878
 879
 880
 881
 882
 883
 884
 885
 886
 887
 888
 889
 890
 891
 892
 893
 894
 895
 896
 897
 898
 899
 900
 901
 902
 903
 904
 905
 906
 907
 908
 909
 910
 911
 912
 913
 914
 915
 916
 917
 918
 919
 920
 921
 922
 923
 924
 925
 926
 927
 928
 929
 930
 931
 932
 933
 934
 935
 936
 937
 938
 939
 940
 941
 942
 943
 944
 945
 946
 947
 948
 949
 950
 951
 952
 953
 954
 955
 956
 957
 958
 959
 960
 961
 962
 963
 964
 965
 966
 967
 968
 969
 970
 971
 972
 973
 974
 975
 976
 977
 978
 979
 980
 981
 982
 983
 984
 985
 986
 987
 988
 989
 990
 991
 992
 993
 994
 995
 996
 997
 998
 999
 1000
 1001
 1002
 1003
 1004
 1005
 1006
 1007
 1008
 1009
 10010
 10011
 10012
 10013
 10014
 10015
 10016
 10017
 10018
 10019
 10020
 10021
 10022
 10023
 10024
 10025
 10026
 10027
 10028
 10029
 10030
 10031
 10032
 10033
 10034
 10035
 10036
 10037
 10038
 10039
 10040
 10041
 10042
 10043
 10044
 10045
 10046
 10047
 10048
 10049
 10050
 10051
 10052
 10053
 10054
 10055
 10056
 10057
 10058
 10059
 10060
 10061
 10062
 10063
 10064
 10065
 10066
 10067
 10068
 10069
 10070
 10071
 10072
 10073
 10074
 10075
 10076
 10077
 10078
 10079
 10080
 10081
 10082
 10083
 10084
 10085
 10086
 10087
 10088
 10089
 10090
 10091
 10092
 10093
 10094
 10095
 10096
 10097
 10098
 10099
 100100
 100101
 100102
 100103
 100104
 100105
 100106
 100107
 100108
 100109
 100110
 100111
 100112
 100113
 100114
 100115
 100116
 100117
 100118
 100119
 100120
 100121
 100122
 100123
 100124
 100125
 100126
 100127
 100128
 100129
 100130
 100131
 100132
 100133
 100134
 100135
 100136
 100137
 100138
 100139
 100140
 100141
 100142
 100143
 100144
 100145
 100146
 100147
 100148
 100149
 100150
 100151
 100152
 100153
 100154
 100155
 100156
 100157
 100158
 100159
 100160
 100161
 100162
 100163
 100164
 100165
 100166
 100167
 100168
 100169
 100170
 100171
 100172
 100173
 100174
 100175
 100176
 100177
 100178
 100179
 100180
 100181
 100182
 100183
 100184
 100185
 100186
 100187
 100188
 100189
 100190
 100191
 100192
 100193
 100194
 100195
 100196
 100197
 100198
 100199
 100200
 100201
 100202
 100203
 100204
 100205
 100206
 100207
 100208
 100209
 100210
 100211
 100212
 100213
 100214
 100215
 100216
 100217
 100218
 100219
 100220
 100221
 100222
 100223
 100224
 100225
 100226
 100227
 100228
 100229
 100230
 100231
 100232
 100233
 100234
 100235
 100236
 100237
 100238
 100239
 100240
 100241
 100242
 100243
 100244
 100245
 100246
 100247
 100248
 100249
 100250
 100251
 100252
 100253
 100254
 100255
 100256
 100257
 100258
 100259
 100260
 100261
 100262
 100263
 100264
 100265
 100266
 100267
 100268
 100269
 100270
 100271
 100272
 100273
 100274
 100275
 100276
 100277
 100278
 100279
 100280
 100281
 100282
 100283
 100284
 100285
 100286
 100287
 100288
 100289
 100290
 100291
 100292
 100293
 100294
 100295
 100296
 100297
 100298
 100299
 100300
 100301
 100302
 100303
 100304
 100305
 100306
 100307
 100308
 100309
 100310
 100311
 100312
 100313
 100314
 100315
 100316
 100317
 100318
 100319
 100320
 100321
 100322
 100323
 100324
 100325
 100326
 100327
 100328
 100329
 100330
 100331
 100332
 100333
 100334
 100335
 100336
 100337
 100338
 100339
 100340
 100341
 100342
 100343
 100344
 100345
 100346
 100347
 100348
 100349
 100350
 100351
 100352
 100353
 100354
 100355
 100356
 100357
 100358
 100359
 100360
 100361
 100362
 100363
 100364
 100365
 100366
 100367
 100368
 100369
 100370
 100371
 100372
 100373
 100374
 100375
 100376
 100377
 100378
 100379
 100380
 100381
 100382
 100383
 100384
 100385
 100386
 100387
 100388
 100389
 100390
 100391
 100392
 100393
 100394
 100395
 100396
 100397
 100398
 100399
 100400
 100401
 100402
 100403
 100404
 100405
 100406
 100407
 100408
 100409

1 Plaintiffs Fluidigm Corporation and Fluidigm Canada Inc. (collectively “Fluidigm”)
 2 hereby respectfully submit this Reply in support of the pending “Motion to Amend.”¹ Fluidigm’s
 3 Motion to Amend directly and appropriately addresses deficiencies identified by the Court in its
 4 Order dismissing Fluidigm’s indirect infringement claims, intentional interference with contract
 5 claim, and willful infringement allegations. *See* DE 49.

6 Significantly, IONpath’s Opposition concedes that Fluidigm sufficiently pleads indirect
 7 infringement in its “Second Amended Complaint”. DE 54. As such, IONpath’s Opposition is
 8 limited to only challenging the sufficiency of Fluidigm’s amended allegations that support its
 9 claims for intentional interference with contract and IONpath’s willful infringement. Neither
 10 challenge holds water.

11 IONpath’s sole attack upon Fluidigm’s amended intentional interference claim is based
 12 upon IONpath’s conclusion that the Court needs to infer that Fluidigm’s identified customers
 13 actually breached their contracts. Yet, IONpath’s argument is directly belied by the facts and
 14 allegations in the Second Amended Complaint. For example, Paragraph 132 of the proposed
 15 Second Amended Complaint expressly identifies eight Fluidigm customers who breached, and
 16 were induced to breach, their contracts by using Fluidigm’s reagents with IONpath’s MIBIscope.
 17 DE 49-3 at ¶ 132. Further, Paragraphs 86 through 88 of the proposed Second Amended
 18 Complaint identify how Stanford University: (i) purchased Fluidigm Maxpar® X8 Multimetal
 19

20

21 ¹ Fluidigm would like to use this opportunity to briefly apprise the Court regarding an issue
 22 the Court recently raised in granting the parties Stipulation permitting, in part, Fluidigm to amend
 23 its infringement contentions. Fluidigm was aware of the requirement that it procure leave of
 24 Court in order to properly serve amended infringement contentions, raised the issue with
 25 IONpath’s counsel, and proposed that the Stipulation provide that Fluidigm may amend its
 26 infringement contentions “by the latter of this Court’s Order approving this Stipulation or
 27 February 24, 2020,” which would comply with Patent L.R. 3-6. IONpath’s counsel rejected the
 28 proposal, and threatened to withdraw from the Stipulation unless Fluidigm’s amended contentions
 were served upon it on Monday, February 24, 2020, regardless of whether the Court had yet had
 an opportunity to rule upon the Stipulation. IONpath then delayed until 10:16 p.m. on February
 24 before giving Fluidigm permission to file the Stipulation. As such, Fluidigm included footnote
 1, stating that the parties are aware “that Fluidigm’s supplementation requires Court approval
 pursuant to Patent L.R. 3-6,” in the Stipulation in the event the Court denied the Stipulation.
 Fluidigm is respectful of the Court’s rules and the time required considering motions and
 stipulations.

1 Labeling Kits and Antibody Labeling Kits; (ii) agreed to be bound by the Ts&Cs²; and (iii)
 2 breached the terms of the Ts&Cs. IONpath's improper conduct is memorialized in part through
 3 Drs. Bendall and Angelo's 2018 publication, as well as yet another article (this time in January
 4 2020), which conclusively demonstrate that a Fluidigm customer, Stanford, breached its contracts
 5 with Fluidigm. IONpath encouraged Fluidigm's customers improper use and breach of contracts
 6 by using Fluidigm's Maxpar reagents with IONpath's infringing MIBI System. Fluidigm's
 7 proposed Second Amended Complaint is properly plead.

8 IONpath's only other challenge is to the well-plead facts regarding IONpath's willful
 9 infringement. The proposed Second Amended Complaint details how, after IONpath was served
 10 with both the Original and First Amended Complaints, IONpath nevertheless intentionally and
 11 willfully proceeded to continue to solicit customers and launch, market, advertise, offer for sale,
 12 and sell its infringing MIBIscope. *See, e.g.*, DE 49-3 at ¶¶ 112-113. Representative of its
 13 conduct, at the November 6-10, 2019 SITC Meeting, despite its knowledge of its infringing
 14 conduct, IONpath went so far as to orchestrate having MIBIscope customers promote the
 15 infringing products, provide live testimonials, and describe how IONpath taught them to engage
 16 in the infringing methods and use the infringing MIBI technology. *Id.* at ¶ 116. In the three
 17 months after IONpath's commercial launch, IONpath and its founders intentionally and willfully
 18 coordinated the publication of multiple articles and, perhaps most egregiously, released a brand
 19 new infringing product line, the MIBI Service, through which IONpath directly infringes on
 20 Fluidigm's asserted claims and patents by analyzing samples with an IONpath MIBIscope. *Id.* at
 21 ¶ 123. Fluidigm has properly plead that IONpath's conduct constitutes knowing, willful,
 22 intentional, and deliberate infringement of Fluidigm's Patents. *See id.* at ¶¶ 118, 124.

23 For the reasons set forth in the Motion to Amend and this Reply, the Court should grant
 24 Fluidigm's Motion to Amend.

27 ² Defined terms not otherwise defined in this Motion to Amend shall have the meaning
 28 assigned to them in the Second Amended Complaint filed at Docket Entry ("DE") 49-3.

1 **I. IONPATH INTENTIONALLY INTERFERED WITH FLUIDIGM CUSTOMERS.**

2 Fluidigm's proposed Second Amended Complaint properly asserts a claim for intentional
 3 interference with Fluidigm's customers. IONpath cannot and does not dispute that the proposed
 4 amendment clearly demonstrates four of the five required elements: (1) Fluidigm and its
 5 customers are bound by a valid contract, the Ts&Cs (DE 49-3 at ¶ 82); (2) IONpath had
 6 affirmative knowledge of the Ts&Cs (*id.* at ¶ 81); (3) IONpath engaged in improper and
 7 intentional conduct designed to induce a breach of the Ts&Cs (*see id.* at ¶¶ 86-88, 91, 128-124);
 8 and (4) IONpath's conduct has damaged Fluidigm (*id.* at ¶¶ 91, 133-135). *See CRST Van*
 9 *Expedited, Inc. v. Werner Enterprises, Inc.*, 479 F.3d 1099, 1105 (9th Cir. 2007) (quoting
 10 *Quelimane Co. v. Stewart Title Guar. Co.*, 19 Cal.4th 26, 55, 77 Cal.Rptr.2d 709, 960 P.2d 513
 11 (1998)). As such, IONpath is left to summarily argue that the fifth required prong – allegations of
 12 breach of contract – is somehow missing and must be inferred by the Court. Yet, it is properly
 13 plead and fully met by the amendment.

14 Fluidigm properly pleads its intentional interference claim -- and IONpath's argument
 15 fails -- for at least two reasons: (1) Fluidigm specifically alleges that eight MIBIscope customers
 16 breached their Ts&Cs with Fluidigm in Paragraph 132; and (2) Fluidigm's supporting facts make
 17 clear that these customers breached Fluidigm's Ts&Cs. Disregarding Fluidigm's well-plead facts
 18 – including the customers' breach of contracts, IONpath argues that the claim is deficient based
 19 upon the contention that the Court must infer that there was a breach. Not so. Fluidigm
 20 specifically alleged that IONpath's improper conduct resulted in at least eight of its customers
 21 breaching the Ts&Cs:

22 132. As of January 2020, at least eight of IONpath's customers purchased
 23 Fluidigm's antibodies and reagents – and entered into contracts with Fluidigm
 24 where they accepted and agreed to be bound by Fluidigm's Ts&Cs – for use with
 an IONpath MIBIscope and in breach of the Ts&Cs.

25 DE 49-3 at ¶ 132.

26 IONpath next appears to argue, without any legal analysis, that the Court should find that
 27 Count One is somehow futile because, in Paragraph 90, Fluidigm alleges that “[a]ll eight of these

1 Fluidigm customers agreed to be bound by the Ts&Cs and, on information and belief, have
 2 breached and continue to breach the Ts&Cs by improperly using Fluidigm antibodies and
 3 reagents with the infringing MIBIscope, as promoted, marketed, encouraged, and advertised by
 4 IONpath.” *Id.* at 90. Taking as true the allegations in both Paragraphs 132 and 90, all eight
 5 customers breached the Ts&Cs and, on information and belief, continue to do so as a result of
 6 IONpath’s improper conduct. IONpath’s Opposition ignores Paragraph 132 in its entirety.

7 Even if the Court were to ignore the facts plead in Paragraph 132, IONpath’s reliance
 8 upon the use of the words “on information and belief” in Paragraph 90 is off the mark.

9 Allegations made “on information and belief” are completely sufficient under established Ninth
 10 Circuit case law under Rule 8, and even under Rule 9 where supported by facts (in the context of
 11 the heightened pleading standard for Rule 9 for fraud). *Nayab v. Capital One Bank (USA), N.A.*,
 12 942 F.3d 480, 493–94 (9th Cir. 2019); *see also Waldo v. Eli Lilly & Co.*, No. CIV. S-13-0789
 13 LKK, 2013 WL 5554623, at *5 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 8, 2013) (holding that under Rule 8, “[t]hat an
 14 allegation is pled on information and belief is neither dispositive nor particularly germane.”).
 15 Fluidigm’s facts supporting its contention and belief that at least eight IONpath MIBIscope
 16 customers breached and continue to breach Fluidigm’s Ts&Cs are quite clear:

- 17 • IONpath’s infringing MIBIscope system *requires* “the use of antibodies
 18 specifically designed to target biomarkers of interest within the sample being
 19 analyzed” DE 49-3 at ¶ 76.
- 20 • IONpath began selling, and sold, its infringing MIBIscope system prior to
 21 IONpath having “any of its own reagents or antibodies available for sale to its
 22 customers and potential customers.” *Id.* at ¶ 80.
- 23 • With full knowledge of Fluidigm’s Ts&Cs, Dr. Nolan, on behalf of Stanford,
 24 “placed 10 orders of Maxpar® X8 Multimetal Labeling Kits as well as 8 Maxpar®
 25 x8 Antibody Labeling Kits with Fluidigm between February 2018 and September
 26 2018 for use with the MIBIscope method and system.” *Id.* at ¶ 84.
- 27 • Dr. Nolan’s lab at Stanford possessed a MIBIscope when it placed these orders,
 28 and Stanford agreed to be bound by Fluidigm’s Ts&Cs when it placed these
 29 Fluidigm reagent and antibody orders. *Id.* at ¶¶ 84-85.
- 30 • Drs. Bendall and Angelo, “also associated with Stanford University” published a
 31 paper in September 2018 “that admitted to improperly using Fluidigm’s Maxpar

1 X8 Antibody labeling kit as a Critical Commercial Assay for IONpath's
 2 technology [its MIBI System], in direct violation of the Ts&Cs." *Id.* at ¶ 86.

3

- 4 Drs. Bendall and Angelo also published an additional article, on January 17, 2020,
 again promoting the improper use of Fluidigm's reagents and antibodies with
 IONpath's MIBIscope. *Id.* at ¶ 88.
- 5 "Fluidigm was the first, and the only, company that has commercially available,
 6 validated reagents and antibodies." *Id.* at ¶ 77. And, in fact, seven additional
 7 customers (besides Stanford), who also have a MIBIscope, purchased Fluidigm
 8 antibodies and reagents from Fluidigm after Drs. Bendall and Angelo published
 their article in 2018 describing the improper use of IONpath's technology with
 Fluidigm's reagents and antibodies. *Id.* at ¶ 89.

9 There is no ambiguity as to whether Fluidigm alleges or has tendered facts in support of a
 10 breach of contract. Further, based upon the facts and allegations recited in the proposed Second
 11 Amended Complaint, it is simply not plausible that a company would spend in excess of
 12 \$1,000,000 on a MIBIscope that it could not use. *See id.* at ¶¶ 78 and 133. Moreover, IONpath's
 13 argument that because Fluidigm is the only company with "commercially available, validated
 14 reagents and antibodies" somehow implies that MIBIscope customers are making their own
 15 reagents and antibodies misses the mark. Fluidigm, based upon its own sales records, specifically
 16 alleges that those eight customers (who own MIBIsopes) actually purchased Fluidigm's reagents
 17 and antibodies after IONpath began publishing using the MIBIscope with Fluidigm's reagents
 18 and antibodies. *Id.* at ¶ 89.

19 Thus, having been educated and encouraged by IONpath to purchase and use IONpath's
 20 MIBIscope with Fluidigm reagents and antibodies, despite the customers being contractually
 21 bound not to use Fluidigm's reagents and antibodies in such manner (and IONpath's knowledge
 22 of such contractual prohibitions), the identified customers were encouraged to and did breach the
 23 Ts&Cs that they entered into with Fluidigm.³

24

25

26

27

28

³ IONpath also attempts to inject new allegations (without any request for judicial notice – which, even then, only permits a court to take notice of the existence of the website not the truth of the content therein) by quoting a discrete passage from the University of Colorado's website for the proposition that the research institutions can *now* develop antibodies and reagents. Opposition at 3. First, the attempt to inject the passage is wholly inappropriate under the 12(b)(6) standard and is, therefore, irrelevant to the Motion to Amend. Second, whether the passage supports IONpath's allegation is completely unclear from the information provided. Third, IONpath's argument cannot overcome the fact that Fluidigm has properly plead breach of

1 IONpath's argument that Fluidigm's allegations are futile is simply wrong. "[A] proposed
 2 amendment is futile only if no set of facts can be proved under the amendment to the pleadings
 3 that would constitute a valid and sufficient claim" *FlatWorld Interactives LLC v. Apple Inc.*,
 4 No. 12-CV-01956-WHO, 2013 WL 6406437, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 6, 2013) (quoting *Miller v.*
 5 *Rykoff-Sexton, Inc.*, 845 F.2d 209, 214 (9th Cir. 1988) (citations omitted)). This standard is the
 6 same as a motion to dismiss pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6). *Id.* Here, not only has Fluidigm properly
 7 plead breach of contract, there is no basis to conclude that there is any futility.

8 In any event, Paragraph 132 makes clear that IONpath has indeed induced Fluidigm
 9 customers to breach the Ts&Cs and that the Court should grant Fluidigm leave to amend.

10 **II. IONPATH'S WILLFUL AND EGREGIOUS INFRINGEMENT.**

11 The Court's ruling on the motion to dismiss (DE 46) did not give IONpath *carte blanche*
 12 permission to infringe on Fluidigm's Patents. The Court very clearly stated that "culpability is
 13 generally measured against the knowledge of the actor at the time of the challenged conduct." *Id.*
 14 at p. 8 (quoting *Halo Elecs., Inc. v. Pulse Elecs., Inc.*, 136 S. Ct. 1923, 1933, 195 L. Ed. 2d 278
 15 (2016)). The Court went on to explain that enhanced damages are reserved for cases involving
 16 "willful, wanton, malicious, bad-faith, deliberate, consciously wrongful, flagrant or – indeed
 17 characteristic of a pirate." *Id.* And that, as both parties acknowledged, "a patent infringement
 18 plaintiff does not have to prove willfulness at the pleading stage . . ." *Id.*

19 In the proposed Second Amended Complaint, Fluidigm has included detailed allegations
 20 exhibiting how, after IONpath undoubtedly learned of its infringement via service of the
 21 Complaint and First Amended Complaint, IONpath proceeded with, and perhaps accelerated, its
 22 efforts to make, use, offer for sale, sell, and market its infringing MIBI System. *See* DE 49-4
 23 (redline for Proposed Complaint) at ¶¶ 7, 39, 47, 57, 88, 106-108, 111-123. The question for
 24 Fluidigm's Motion to Amend is whether, since IONpath was served with the Complaint and First
 25

26
 27 contract – and, at most, the argument raises questions of fact. And, fourth, even if, *arguendo*, the
 28 passage were correct in part, such allegations do not show that the customers had the ability to
 make the reagents and antibodies for a period of time in which they breached the Ts&Cs.

1 Amended Complaint in this lawsuit, has IONpath's conduct constituted willful infringement of
 2 Fluidigm's Patents-in-Suit.

3 There is no doubt that, with full knowledge of its infringement: (i) IONpath knowingly
 4 elected to launch its MIBIscope product; (ii) marketed, advertised, and presented its infringing
 5 product at the 2019 SITC Meeting; (iii) continued to publish articles demonstrating IONpath's
 6 *direct infringement*; and (iv) encouraged third-parties to acquire and use infringing MIBIscope
 7 products and methods. *See id.* If the foregoing intentional acts are not sufficient, IONpath
 8 knowingly, intentionally, and shockingly launched a brand new product line, the MIBI Service,
 9 pursuant to which IONpath will directly infringe on Fluidigm's Patents-in-Suit as a service for
 10 paying customers. *Id.* at ¶ 123. In short, IONpath has tried every avenue available to steal
 11 customers from Fluidigm by aggressively marketing, using, and selling its infringing products.
 12 Given the above conduct after IONpath's service of the First Amended Complaint in October
 13 2019, the Court should grant Fluidigm leave to amend to include a claim for willful infringement.

14 IONpath attempts to downplay its knowing, willful, intentional, and aggressive efforts and
 15 conduct to promote and sell its infringing systems as "more marketing materials." Opposition at
 16 3 (emphasis omitted). The facts and conduct that IONpath attempts to gloss over is that IONpath,
 17 when it solicited customers with the "more marketing materials," indisputably had and has
 18 knowledge of its infringement of the Patents-in-Suit and has never argued that Fluidigm's direct
 19 infringement claims are deficient.

20 IONpath also claims that Fluidigm has not alleged egregious conduct. This is false.
 21 Fluidigm specifically alleged that it has been harmed by IONpath's "egregious continued
 22 infringement," and that IONpath egregiously disregarded Fluidigm's rights by cavalierly,
 23 commercially launching the MIBIscope and actively participating in the 2019 SITC Meeting. DE
 24 49-3 at ¶¶ 118, 124.

25 Whether IONpath, with full knowledge of its infringement, is willfully infringing
 26 Fluidigm's Patents by making, using, launching, offering for sale, and selling not only the
 27 MIBIscope product but also the MIBI Service, and by presenting at a conference with MIBIscope

1 users who laud how IONpath helped them directly infringe on Fluidigm's Patents, should be
 2 decided on the facts – not as matter of law on the pleadings. *See UPF Innovations, LLC v.*
 3 *Intrinsic ID, Inc.*, No. 19-CV-02711-VC, 2019 WL 4729601, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 17, 2019)
 4 (quoting *Firstface Co. v. Apple*, Inc., No. 18-CV-02245-JD, 2019 WL 1102374, at *2 (N.D. Cal.
 5 Mar. 8, 2019) for the proposition that “[t]he intensely factual issues inherent in a claim of
 6 willfulness counsel against early dismissal at the pleading stage.”).

7 **III. IONPATH'S IMPROPER ARGUMENTS.**

8 Throughout the Opposition, IONpath attempts to improperly inject its own allegations into
 9 its Opposition, which IONpath contemporaneously concedes is wholly improper and must be
 10 disregarded. Opposition at fn.2. Compounding its improper argument, IONpath then attempts to
 11 subtly weave its incorrect allegations into its Opposition. *See* Opposition p. 5 (referring to
 12 allegations in the Complaint as “false,” premised upon IONpath’s own unsupported and improper
 13 allegations). IONpath’s attempt to do an end run around the applicable legal standard is improper
 14 and should be disregarded. *See FlatWorld Interactives LLC*, 2013 WL 6406437, at *3 (applying
 15 12(b)(6) standard to determining viability of a motion to amend).

16 **CONCLUSION**

17 For the foregoing reasons, Fluidigm respectfully requests that the Court grant Fluidigm’s
 18 Motion for Leave to File a Second Amended Complaint.

19
 20 Dated: March 5, 2020

Daniel P. Crane
 21
 22 BRYAN CAVE LEIGHTON PAISNER LLP

23 By: /s/ Daniel P. Crane
 24 Daniel P. Crane

25
 26
 27
 28 Attorneys for Fluidigm Corporation
 and Fluidigm Canada Inc.